

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-33 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-2 and 4-33 stand rejected. Claim 3 has been previously canceled. Claims 1, 2 and 4-31 have been amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application, drawings and claims as originally filed and, as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2 and 11-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lanier et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,103,498; hereinafter "Lanier"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that Lanier appears to disclose a computer aided help system 300 that provides help to a user of a computer program on a computer 100 based on the tasks recently completed by the user. The help system 300 monitors the activities performed by the user, such as "saving a file in a paint application or copying a block of text in a word-processing application" (see at least Col. 3, lines 10-16). Based on the user activities, if help is requested, the help system 300 checks rules for known patterns. In contrast to Lanier, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

... storing the knowledge base in a computer-based medium, the computer-based medium being accessible to a **plurality of users over a user interface;**
receiving an incoming message from at least one specific user of the plurality of users **from the user interface**, where the incoming message **characterizes a mobile platform technical issue relating to the mobile platform;**

importing a first set of **mobile platform related data** from the incoming message into one or more search roles of an inquiry...(emphasis added).

In view of the above discussion, Applicants respectfully assert that Lanier does not teach, suggest or disclose each and every feature of Claim 1. In particular, Lanier does not teach, suggest or disclose importing a first set of **mobile platform related data** from the incoming message into one or more search roles of an inquiry, storing the knowledge base in a computer-based medium, the computer-based medium being accessible to a **plurality of users over a user interface**, or receiving an incoming message from **at least one specific user of the plurality of users from the user interface**, where the incoming message characterizes a **mobile platform technical issue** relating to the mobile platform.

Rather, Lanier discloses a help system 300 for use by a user of a computer 100, via computer software loaded on that computer 100. The help system 300 is not accessible by a plurality of users from a user interface, rather it is accessible by the **sole user of that computer** that has the software installed on it. Furthermore, Lanier does not teach, suggest or disclose receiving a **mobile platform technical issue** from at least one specific user **of the plurality of users from the user interface** as claimed. In addition, Applicants note that modifying Lanier to include receiving a mobile platform technical issue from at least one specific user of the plurality of users from the user interface would impermissibly modify the method of operation of the help system of Lanier, and thus, is improper. Applicants also submit that it would be improper to modify Lanier to arrive at Claim 1, as there is no evidence or suggestion of such a

configuration in Lanier (see *Ex Parte Katoh et. al.*, Appeal 20071460, Decided May 29, 2007).

Accordingly, as Lanier, singly or in combination, does not teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

With regard to Claims 2 and 11-17, Claims 2 and 11-17 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1, and thus, should be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth for Claim 1 above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 2 and 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-10 and 19-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanier in view of "Role-Based Access Control Models" by Ravi S. Sandhu et al., 1996 hereinafter "Sandhu". Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanier as applied to Claim 17, and further in view of duplication of parts. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully refer the Office to the remarks regarding Claims 1, 2 and 11-17 for a discussion of the Lanier reference. With regard to Sandhu, Applicants respectfully assert that Sandhu does not remedy the above-mentioned shortcomings of Lanier. In this regard, Sandhu appears to disclose a role-based access control system for granting or restricting the access of users to computer based resources. In contrast to the cited references, independent Claim 19 recites:

...storing the knowledge base in a computer-based medium, **the computer-based medium being accessible to a plurality of users by a user interface;**

receiving a mobile platform technical issue from **at least one of the plurality of users from the user interface...**(emphasis added).

Independent Claim 27 recites:

...receiving an incoming message over a computer network from a customer, where the incoming message characterizes a mobile platform technical issue associated with the mobile platform **that is generated by the customer interacting with a user interface** (emphasis added).

Independent Claim 32 recites:

...**a user interface that enables the plurality of users to access** the knowledge base... (emphasis added).

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that Lanier and Sandhu, either alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest or disclose each and every feature of Claims 19, 27 and 32. As discussed, Lanier does not teach, suggest or disclose receiving a mobile platform technical issue from at least one specific user of the **plurality of users from the user interface**. Further, as discussed, Lanier does not teach, suggest or disclose receiving a **mobile platform technical issue** from at least one specific user of the plurality of users from the user interface as claimed. Applicants assert that Sandhu does not remedy these shortcomings of Lanier. Rather, Sandhu discloses merely that it is desirable to restrict access to various computer resources.

Accordingly, as Lanier and Sandhu, singly or in combination, do not teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of Claims 19, 27 and 32, Applicants respectfully request the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 19, 27 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).


With regard to Claims 4-10, 18, 20-26, 28-31 and 33, Claims 4-10, 18, 20-26, 28-31 and 33 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1, 19, 27 or 32, and thus, should be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth for Claims 1, 19, 27 and 32 above. With regard to Claim 18, as noted in Applicants' specification as filed, the ability of the claimed method to provide reusable solutions for the more than two million parts of the plurality of mobile platforms provides unexpected results over other known servicing concepts, as most cannot handle the complexity of the modern day mobile platform. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 4-10, 18, 20-26, 28-31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/17/08

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/chs